



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/622,650	01/18/2001	Stephen James Williams	C36510/10472	9072
49328	7590	02/10/2006	EXAMINER	
BRYAN CAVE LLP 211 NORTH BROADWAY SUITE 3600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2750			NGO, LIEN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3754	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

P

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/622,650	Applicant(s) WILLIAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner LIEN TM NGO	Art Unit 3754	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-21, 23-34 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26 and 36 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-21, 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/21/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 15-18, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmid et al. (4,053,648). Schmid et al. discloses, in figs. 1 and 3-6, a single use feed bottle made of plastic materials, the bottle including a body 2 for holding a quantity of milk or other liquid, the body having a mouth 7, which is sealable in a fluid tight manner by means of a screw-threaded closure 20, the closure and the body having on their inner and outer surfaces respectively mutually cooperating formations to cause the closure to be irremovable from the body after the closure has reached a limit position on the body, in which it forms a fluid-tight fit with the body, wherein a teat 23 and the closure form an integral unit, and a stiffening ring integral with the body 30,

Art Unit: 3754

which is capable of providing resistance to inwards deformation of the mouth of the body; wherein the mutually cooperating formations comprises a set of ratchet teeth 44 and lugs 45.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid et al.. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the bottle body and the closure of Schmid et al. from material as claimed, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

6. Claims 15-21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cautereels (5,316,160) in view of Schmid et al..

Cautereels discloses, in figs. 1 and 2, a feeding bottle comprising a body made of a transparent material and graduation markings; a closure 43 being integral with a teat 18, and a stiffening ring 24 integral with the body.

Cautereels does not disclose the feeding bottle being single used and the closure being irremovable from the body.

Schmid et al. teach a feeding bottle being single used and a closure being irremovable from the body.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the feeding bottle of Cautereels with the irremovable closure having a non-reversing lock, as taught by Schmid et al., in order to form a single use feeding bottle.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 26 and 36 are allowed.
8. Claim 25 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-21, 23 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LIEN TM NGO whose telephone number is 571-272-4545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM -6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL MAR can be reached on 571-272-4906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LIEN TM NGO
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3754

January 27, 2006

